

**REMARKS**

***Claims***

Claim 1-3 are the claims originally pending in the application.

***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112***

Claim 3 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner alleges that the terms “logical sum”, “status signal, and “logical product” recited in claim 3 are relative terms, and that they render claim 3 indefinite. The Examiner also alleges that the meaning of these terms is not ascertainable by one of ordinary skill in the art in light of the specification.

The meaning of these terms is very well known in electronics and control theory. Applicants submit that the meaning and scope of this terms is well known to one of ordinary skill in the art. Applicants also submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would be reasonably apprised of the meaning of these terms at least in view of the description of Figures 5A and 5B provided on pages 10 and 11 of the specification.

In view of the above exemplary reasons, Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the 112, second paragraph rejection of claim 3.

***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)***

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ziegler et al.

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the reference must teach every element and limitation of the Applicant’s claims either explicitly or inherently. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §

102 are proper only when the claimed subject matter is identically disclosed or described in the prior art. See MPEP § 2131. In fact, the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the claim. Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Applicants submit that Ziegler does not anticipate claims 1 and 2 because it does not teach every element claimed in these claims.

Regarding claim 1, Applicants submit that Ziegler does not disclose the claimed pendants. A pendant is an instrument well known in the art. In generally, a pendant is used to teach robots.

Ziegler discloses an apparatus for monitoring a movement of a robot (for example, monitoring a moving area) wherein a servo power supply of a robot is put in an ON/OFF state on the basis of an operation of an enabling switch by a robot operator. Further, two CPU's perform a double check in order to ensure a high safety.

On the contrary, in the present invention, a servo power supply is made when both the main operator and a sub operator close an enabling switch.

The Examiner states that CAN controllers 62 and 64 correspond to the claimed pendants. The Examiner further contends that each of these CAN controllers are held by micro-computers 58 and 60. *See Office Action page 3 and Figure 3 of Ziegler.*

Ziegler describes actuators/drive units 24, 26, 28, 30 in a robot system 12. *See Fig. 1.* Based on the status of the switching contacts of the protective doors 20, 22, and/or drive units 24, 26, 28, and 30, the safety controller 38 transmits a release signal to the control unit 36, which then allows the robot 12 to execute an operation. *See col. 8, line 46- col. 9, line 15.* The actual status values of the drive units 24-30 are received by the safety controller 38 via the buses

CAN\_A and CAN\_B. The CAN controllers 62 and 64 processes the information transmitted via the buses CAN\_A and CAN\_B, and makes this information available to the respective micro-computers 58 and 60. See col. 10, lines 32-50.

Applicants submit that the Examiner's interpretation of the term pendant is overly broad and unreasonable. As discussed above, the CAN controllers 62 and 64 do not correspond to the claimed pendants at least because the CAN controllers are not used to teach the robots.

Applicants submit that, because of the deficiencies noted above in the teachings of Zeigler, the Examiner has not met his burden of establishing anticipation. Therefore, for all the above reasons, independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Zeigler.

Regarding claim 2, in addition to the arguments that Applicants presented above for claim 1, Applicants submit that the Examiner's analysis is inconsistent and that Ziegler does not teach every feature of claim 2. With respect to claim 1, the Examiner states that the CAN-controller corresponds to the claimed pendants. *See Office Action page 3.* With respect to claim 2, the Examiner states that the CAN-controllers correspond to the claimed enabling switches. Such an analysis is inconsistent because the Examiner refers to the same element of Ziegler as corresponding to two different elements (pendant in claim 1 and enabling switches in claim 2). As such, any further analysis by the Examiner must fail.

Applicants also submit that Ziegler does not teach that a servo-power supply is put in an ON state, when both the subordinate and main enabling switches are closed, as required by claim 2.

Therefore, claim 2 is also not anticipated by Ziegler.

***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)***

Claims 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ziegler.

Regarding claim 3, the Examiner loosely states that the claimed invention is obvious because “the logical sum and product of the micro-computers 58 and 60 would depend in its binary output result to activate the robot-actuators”. *See Office Action page 5.*

Applicants submit that such statements by the Examiner are merely conclusory and have not been articulated to support a proper obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Further, the Ziegler reference does not suggest the claimed first and second logic circuits, as required by claim 3 (as amended). Ziegler also does not suggest that a signal is supplied to a servo power supply controlling device that controls an ON/OFF state of the servo power supply, based on the logical product generated by the second logic circuit. The mere disclosure of a digital circuit in a micro-computer taught by Ziegler does not suggest the above feature of claim 3.

Applicants submit that the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness for claim 3 at least because Zeigler does not suggest the present invention as a whole including the teachings discussed above.

**New Claims**

Applicants add new claims 4-7. These claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency and also by virtue of the features recited therein. The features in these claims are clearly supported by *at least* figures 3, 5A and 5B, and pages 10 and 11 of the specification.

## Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Chidambaram.S.Iyer/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

**65565**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Chid S. Iyer  
Registration No. 43,355

Date: December 20, 2007